

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0069365 issued to Howard et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0250130 issued to Billharz et al. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

Howard discloses a limited use browser that a client must run to download content in a view only mode.

Billharz discloses a “Yes/No” window which a user must select within one minute or the user will be signed out.

Claim 1 recites, in part, “a protocol decryption engine interfaced with the browser, the protocol decryption engine operable to decrypt the encrypted protocol associated with the HTML link and authorize execution of the associated restricted browser function without the function confirmation.”

Claim 9 recites, in part, “authorizing execution of the restricted function without the distinct confirmation.”

Claim 18 recites, in part, “a protocol decryption engine interfaced with the browser and operable to override the distinct confirmation requirement upon decryption and validation of the encrypted protocol.”

Howard and Billharz cannot make obvious Claims 1, 9 and 18 because Howard and Billharz fail to teach, disclose or suggest all elements recited by Claims 1, 9 and 18. For example, Howard and Billharz fail to teach, disclose or suggest “a protocol decryption engine interfaced with the browser, the protocol decryption engine operable to decrypt the encrypted protocol associated with the HTML link and authorize execution of the associated restricted browser function without the function confirmation” as recited by Claim 1; “authorizing execution of the restricted function without the distinct confirmation” as recited by Claim 9; and “a protocol decryption engine interfaced with the browser and operable to override the distinct

confirmation requirement upon decryption and validation of the encrypted protocol” as recited by Claim 18. Billharz fails to disclose function confirmation as suggested by the Examiner. Billharz discloses a “Yes/No” window which a user must select within one minute or the user will be signed out from a secure link. Billharz’s “Yes/No” window does not appear to confirm a request made by a client but rather appears when the client is inactive. If the user of Billharz has made a request in need of confirmation, no need exists to establish that the client is active. Further, Billharz does not combine with Howard as suggested by the Examiner because no need would exist for a user of Howard to indicate activity since the user of Howard is attempting to download information. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 1-20.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees which may be necessary and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502264.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on July 15, 2008.

*/Robert W. Holland/*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

*/Robert W. Holland/*

Robert W. Holland  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 40,020